Moreland:

All right. Let's take another minute. Wrap up in about a minute. You see that. OK. All right.

What was the what were some of the things we tried to say last week. What were some of the things that we that we talked about last week and claimed somebody shove the boat off shore for us would you. Well OK. There's more to us. [inaudible audience response] Well there's not more to us than us. But yes there there's [inaudible audience response] Oh there's more to us than our physical stuff right. Right. OK good. There's not more to me than me. But there is more to me than be led by kind of job.

I mean you can be beside yourself. But that's that's about as far as it goes. [inaudible audience comment] That's very nice. Yeah. Weren't we may have the feature of having a body and that and having physical traits but we are not. You and I are not physical. We're not our bodies or our brains or anything of that sort. What else did we talk about along these lines.
Yes [inaudible audience question] well we'll talk about that tonight. This is not it I'm not. Let's not have questions right now. Let's let's just repeat rehearse what we talked. No that's OK I'm not. That's fine. But let's let's just rehearse a few other things we talked about.

Yeah. [inaudible audience comment]

Yeah. Well when I said God occupied space but He's not located in space and that's the same way that you occupy your body but you're not located inside your body. And I mean what I mean by that is if I were to peel the parts of your body apart I'd never find you anywhere inside your body. I couldn't say Oh there you are in your finger or there you are in your heart or the back your throat. I couldn't say there you are in your brain. Yes. You're not stuck up inside your head somewhere - that you're not in there and it's all I try to show you a little bit later neither are your thoughts. You're not up in your brain anywhere OK.

But you do occupy your body. Now what do I mean by that? Well you are aware you're immediately aware of every place in your body. If you're stuck with a pen you're immediately aware of that because you're down there. It's right. It's present to you. You're immediately consciously present of every single region of your body just by being paid attention to it. I mean for example you can have an itch in your foot. And if you attend to your foot you can be immediately aware of that itch immediately aware of it.
God is immediately aware of every place in space. He doesn't see things from afar off. In other words he is not he doesn't have to say it's a long way over there he is immediately personally aware of everywhere in the entire universe and His presence is immediately accessible everywhere. So we ought not think of God it's way far away rather we ought to think of Him as being personally present and aware of, available to me conscious consciously aware of me that sort of thing. All right. Any other comment before.

Yes ma'am.

Speaker 2:

[inaudible...Leaving the body. He said "Today I will see you in heaven...[inaudible]. going to the Father.

Moreland:

Well OK. When Jesus rose from the dead he had a body when the thief on the cross died he didn't have a body. He was disembodied. That makes sense to you? There was a difference then between what happened after Jesus died and what happened to the thief on the cross when he died because His body stayed behind

Speaker 2:
...began taking place...[inaudible]...the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Moreland:

OK. I'm not sure I understand. Try that again.

Speaker 2:

I said he had gone to the Father, the right hand

Moreland:

Yeah yeah.

Speaker 2:

Seated with the Father.

Moreland:

Yes.

Speaker 2:

So the thief who left his body, was to meet Christ in paradise that day?

Moreland:

Yeah. I'm not entirely. Oh Christ when Christ died and was raised there was a period of time. He was actually raised three days later not entirely three days because in the ancient counting a day
counted if it was a period of a day. But on Sunday morning. So there was it there was a time when he was. I see what you're asking now.

There was a time when Christ was disembodied after he'd between the time he died and the time his body was raised a short period of time and he did ascend to Hades and preach judgment to those there and perhaps release we're not completely sure how to take that passage but but the thief on the cross would have had conscious awareness of the presence of Christ after his death. OK I was not looking into your question. OK. Now what I'd like to do this evening is I'd like to now spend the evening trying to to help us get clear on what your mind is or your soul and how you, how you can know that you have one without having to take this by faith.

And so that's what I'd like to talk about this evening and I'm going to proceed for the evening and three steps and I'm going to take my time on this to make sure we're getting it. And you don't need to write this down if you don't like because you're I'm gonna give you a terms that you won't understand right now. But this is just an overview. First thing I'm gonna do is I'm going to acquaint you with some issues. You'll need these issues for the arguments I'll give you later on. So I'll start off by giving you a set of terms and concepts that are going to be helpful to you in thinking about what will argue after that.
The second thing I'm going to argue is after I've given you some background information I'm going to argue that your conscious life is not physical but immaterial that your conscious life is not physical but immaterial. That's going to be called property dualism. I'm going to argue for property dualism and I'll tell you what property dualism means. Okay.

The third thing I'm going to argue it's, or the third point I'll make is; not only is your conscious life immaterial, you are immaterial. Because you're the thing that has your conscious life. You are not your conscious life. You're what has it. And not only is your conscious life immaterial. You as the owner of your conscious life are immaterial too. And that's called Substance dualism.

OK so background information; I'll argue for property dualism and I'll argue for substance dualism. Now you're not supposed to understand what I just said and that's OK. One of the reasons you take a course is to learn new ideas and that's why you're here. At least that's why I tell you you're here you may be here for other reasons but anyway that was a kind of modest form of humor. Now. Would you take your text and turn to page 57.

You see on page 57 there is a main heading in the chapter in the text that says "Preliminary Background Issues". See that that's the first thing we're gonna do this evening. Now turn over to page 60 for Canada and the title is "Arguments Supporting Property and Substance Dualism". I'll primarily use these to support property dualism which we'll see what that means shortly.
And then finally if you'll take over look over at the bottom of 67: "Arguments Supporting Substance Dualism" and those are the three things we'll do this evening now turn back. That's just again an overview of what I just told you but I'm breaking that down into the chapter. So after this if you've not read that chapter yet which I would not have anticipated then what a good thing for you to do after tonight's discussion would be to go back and read this chapter and I think the combatant combination of our discussion this evening and the chapter should have a positive impact on you.

Let let me read with you on page 57 now. I want to talk about the mind body problem. Let's read middle of the page: "In some contexts. It is important to make a distinction among the mind the soul the spirit or the self but for our purposes we will use these interchangeably". OK I'm not going to make any distinction at this point between the spirit of the soul of the mind later on I will talk about how I see them differing but for now let's forget about that and when I talk about the mind or the soul I just mean something in you that may not that isn't physical that's immaterial.

OK that's all I mean by it right now. OK. Our main concern is to focus on the mind-body problem and defend the claim that in addition to a body, brain, and a central nervous system, a human being has an immaterial component as well. The main issue in the mind-body problem is
this: Is a human being only one component - say matter - or is a human being two components - matter in mind. That's the issue that we're wanting to know. We want to know are we just complicated physical objects. Are you your brain and your body. Is that what you are or are you a brain in a body plus something else called the mind or a spirit or soul. And that's our question.

OK

Now there are three basic answers to the question and I list those there. There is first of all this is called the mind body problem and what's that problem again - Am I just physical my body or am I my body and mind.

OK so there are two there are three basic cancers on the one hand there is what we call physicalism. Another word for it is materialism, OK. And this is the view that you are nothing but your body or your brain. That's all you are. You're a very complicated functioning brain and that's what you are and you're a computer. Now on the other hand there is a view called dualism and dualism says that you're a body and something immaterial. So far so good. Now unfortunately or for those of us who get paid talking about this, fortunately, gives us something to keep our tenure and so on - there are two different versions of property of dualism. There is what's called property property dualism [writing on chalkboard] - that didn't come out too well my hand got in it - you get the idea. And there is substance dualism
Now here. First thing I've got to do is I've got to clarify this for you so you understand the options and what I want to suggest to you initially is that the Christian the Christian view has always been at least until recent days has always been substance dualism and this view here is the one that's most consistent with life after death. The other two are difficult to sustain life after death on these views. So what we've got to do is clarify this and now when I want to do if you want to say under this is our first category we were talking about these preliminary issues for us.

The first thing I've done. Number one here is I have defined the mind body problem and I've told you that there are three positions physicalism; property dualism; and substance dualism. OK I am a property and a substance dualist you can be both but I'm not just this I I'm a substance dualist and a property dualist both which we'll see later. Now the second thing I want to do is I want to clarify three things for you.

Property, Substance and here's an interesting one - Event. This is this is no time to start leaving. I will clarify this. Let's start off with a property. A property is just an attribute or a characteristic so when I use the term property a property is a is a characteristic or an attribute or a quality. A property of a coffee is a certain it has a certain taste that's a property of the coffee. The number two has the property of being even for example it. Make sense to you? This book has the property of being rectangular or and it also has the property of being blue. It also has the attribute of being smooth. These are the attributes or features that are that are true of the book in English a
property words usually end in N-E-S-S or I-T-Y. Not all the time but things like brownies or redness or sweetness or triangularity would be examples of properties or attributes.

Now God has properties. He has many attributes. One of his properties is omnipotence and other property has its lovable ness kindness. These are actor buttes of God and electron has attributes it has a certain mass it has an attribute of negativity that's that's a property of a certain charged property. These are features that are true of the eye of an electron. Ok, a ball would have a property of being round of being read it maybe weighing five pounds of being smooth and being kind of kind of hard, billiard ball let's say. OK are there any questions at this point about properties, are you Are you clear about what a property is? Any question about this at this point now remit that there is one - Yes [inaudible question]

No a property doesn't have to be measured and in fact what properties themselves are incapable of changing - one of what they can't, the only kind of changes that properties can undergo is they can come and go but they can't change. A redness can't change it can't become squareness and brownness, a redness unfortunately is forever stuck with being redness OK so redness can never become something else that's that's one of the interesting things about properties

Speaker 3:
You say it can come and go. How is that different?
Moreland:
Because events will turn out to be the comings and goings of properties by substances at times.
[audience laughter] But we'll get to that. Yeah go ahead. [inaudible audience question]

Yeah yeah. I don't know that that's a hard question for me to answer. I think part of it depends on what it means to measure something but but materialists probably admit that there are certain kinds of properties like heaviness or shape and weightiness or certain amount of mass. And see one of the questions that we'll have to ask ourselves is: Does a thought that lunch is coming in five minutes - does that thought have any physical properties?

And the answer will turn out to be Zippo! that thought won't weigh anything if it's a heavy thought it won't cause you to need a neck brace. It doesn't have any size. It won't make any sense to ask how many inches long is my thought that lunch is happening in five minutes. It won't make any sense to ask where is it? closer to my left to your right ear. It won't make any sense to ask whether it has negative charge or positive charge. And so the one of the one the points I will try to make is because thoughts don't have physical properties. They're not physical. That will be one of the things we'll try to show. Yeah [inaudible question] we'll see. We'll get to that. But just because a can cause B that doesn't mean a is b and that's a huge mistake all.
It's almost always the case that when A causes B or A is almost never B. That's why something happens to my brain and I lose my memories. That doesn't say anything at all about my memories being pieces of my brain right. That has nothing to do with that. Yes sir [inaudible question].

A physical list would define a thought as we'll see later as a brain event that causes certain publicly observable behavior. So a thought a thought that too into us for would be a certain electrical pattern firing in my brain that would tend to cause my body to do things like this. Shout the word for after hearing two plus two or like a good computer to give the right outputs if I got the right inputs. All right now one of the things that I will say about a property - this is this is very key - is that properties are had by things properties are had by things.

In fact a way to to make this even clear is to point out that substances are individual particular objects that have properties. A substance is an individual particular object that has properties. OK now and an example of a substance would be a billiard ball or an electron or my dog Fido would be an example of a substance. An example of a god is a substance the Angel Gabriel is a substance a tree is a substance a rock is a substance on this view. Now what makes them substances? Well their individual objects and they have properties.
So let's take my dog Fido. My dog Fido is an individual particular thing and it has Fido has the property of being brown Fido has the property of being of weighing 15 pounds he has the property of being hairy and those are properties that are had by Fido OK. You understand? So what properties are had by substances. Substances have properties. Substances aren't had by anything. Substances do the having. They're like professors and properties are like freshmen: They're had as it were. That works better at the University but where they're paid to laugh I guess or they have to laugh. All right let's let's think about this you understand if we're talking about a property like painfulness or a certain property of a certain electrical pattern - that kind of feature. It makes it's gonna make sense to ask well what is it that has that property and you might say the dog or the book cover or something that makes sense to you it's not going to make any sense to ask what is it that has Fido or what is it that has the electron electrons have negativity and negativity is had by the electron. Right. So when we talk about properties we're talking about characteristics and we're talking about substances we're asking what is it that has the characteristic. You see the difference there?

Now would you mind just rehearsing this with your neighbor. I don't mean to bore you with this but we're going somewhere but it's going to take a while to get there. So would you break up with your- no don't break up with your neighbor especially if you're married. But would you talk to your neighbor and haha, or pinch your neighbor if your neighbor needs pinching. [lively chatter].
Have we started having fun yet? OK you had you had a comment or question [inaudible question].

Thank you ma'am. We're now going to move to that [laughter] No, really. That's that's that's the right transition and event is the coming or going of a property in or among substances at or through time. Now just jot it down and we'll talk about it. Jot this down. And let's talk about it. This is gonna be very important because folks here's what we're gonna have to ask: If I stick you with a pen. An event is going to take place inside you and it's going to be in a pain event. It may last for five seconds and it's over with. You understand that. So we're gonna have to ask what is that paint event? And what the physical attack is going to tell us is that paint event is a C fiber firing event. That is it is an event in my nervous system and that's what the paint event is. And I'm going to show you that that ain't so. That the paint event is not an event in your nervous system OK.

If we want to ask if there is a soul we've got to start with this kind of a discussion and automatically you see how ill equipped scientists are to even address the question because you can get a PhD in science and you will never have had any of this. And scientists are not even capable of forming the right questions much less answering them. They don't even have the resources to ask the right questions if all they can do is talk within the language of science.
And so what, one of the key lessons to learn is whether you are a mind or a body - which we're asking tonight - is not itself a scientifically resolvable question. It's not. It's not a scientific question. What a country. Now an event. Well let's give an example of an event an event would be a Leaf's changing color. Another event would be a ball's moving across the table. That would be actually a series of events but we can call it when an event is a baseball game that's an event. OK. A flash of light a flashing of lightning is an event. These are events just you understand you get a feel for when an event at least an example of these examples of events. Now an event is either the coming of a property like when a leaf becomes red or the losing of a property say the leaf losing green or the waters coming to be hot. That's an event, or the water's coming to be cool.

OK that's an event. OK. Now so an event is either the coming of a property or the leaving of a property either in a substance that would be an example of when it happens inside of a sub - let's say a leaf is a thing that has properties. So it's a substance because it has properties maybe it has a certain shape and it's brown. If that leaf loses its color that is that is the leaving of a property within that substance. I make sense to you. Now sometimes properties happen among substances like this and this an event would be these changing their relationship to one another.

Here's where they would they would have the property of being to the left of one another. This would be to the left of, now it's on top up. Now there is a different property to the left of Now on top of that would take place among two things that relates them it's not within each one of them
but it's related to two that make sense to you? I'm not trying to make this too complicated this really is common sense. OK so an event is either when a property just just get a leaf in mind either loses its color at a time or moves relative to the tree where the leaf and the tree or two different substances and they change locations with respect to one another.

Now that can either happen at a time in which case it is an instantaneous event or through time in which case it is an elongated event that takes time. OK an instantaneous event is something that happens at one instant and it's gone a longer event might be something that takes place 10 seconds or maybe like a baseball game could be considered one long event. To understand that and it might have little sub events inside it like the first standing in the second inning OK. Yes. A comment over here. Yes. There you had something that.

Yes ma'am.

Speaker 4:
Does it have to be observable?

Moreland:
Nobody has said anything about being observable. Gabriel's changing what he's thinking about is event. Gabriel is thinking about God and then he suddenly starts thinking about you. That is an
event that happens inside of Gabriel but it's unobservable events don't have to be observable right.

Yes. Oh well you were next and then did did that help you? or was that hinder. Did that hinder you. Yeah. An event is anytime a property leaves something or comes to be in something that a point in time and and there are all kinds of immaterial events. For example what I'll argue is every time you change what you're thinking about an event happens and it's not a physical event. It's a mental event. It's an imprint - in fact it is in principle unobservable as we'll see later. I would never be able to see your thinkings although I could see every piece of your brain. I would never be able to see your thinkings.

In fact you are unable to see them. But you know what they are. By this odd thing we call introspection and it's gonna be kind of an odd thing that you can introspect because physical things won't be able to do this. Yes.

Speaker 5:
I would. I guess I would say an event is an instanceof substance.

Moreland:
Well let's put it this way. There could be. My view is there could be substances without events but there couldn't be events without substances. An instance of a substance. Could you, What do
you mean by an instance of a period of time. Something has happened. In. This period of time so it's been fine.

OK I'm sorry I'm just you're not quite. Could you just say it a different way because I'm seeing you could be saying two things. Are you saying that I'm claiming that the substance is an event or are you claiming that I'm saying the substance has an event occur within it. Which of those would you be thinking I'm saying. That's right. Substances can have events happen inside them.

Does this is this hard for you to understand? I don't know if you're frustrated. I don't know if if you're used to this kind of discussion or whether it's over your head or it's under your head. I just, I don't know. This is not hard. If you'll just if you'll just keep your patience and think for just a minute about an apple. An apple can be sweet. Would you admit that it can turn sour? That's an event. That's what makes it an event. It lost one property it had - it was sweet - and it gained a property it did not have through a period of time right. That that's that's as simple as it is it really is that easy.

Yes sir

You say you can not see thinking,
That's right sir.

but you could see it indirectly, like in the case of an idea.

Well no you can't. Well you can't see. Well ideas right. Right right. Ideas don't become physical things. What happens is ideas cause us to produce physical things that are ISO more thick to the idea that is to say the idea will have a structure to it like a design and there will be parts of the physical object that come to be that will that will have part by part correspondence with with the design but but they won't be - it's not as though the concept in my mind is a picture of the car or anything like that. Ok, we wouldn't want to do that because you can think of a lot of things you're not capable of picturing right like humanity. You can't picture humanity. All you can do is picture individual humans but you have a concept of humanity.

OK let's have two more and then these are these two gentlemen and then I'd like to to move to a little different. I'd like to keep going brother. OK.

Speaker 6:
I actually have two questions.
Moreland: Cultivating the Soul, Session 2a

Moreland:
Okay, You can ask two questions. All right.

Speaker 6:
You know an apple when it's going from sweet to sour, Is losing sweetness and becoming sour one event?

Moreland:
No they are two different events but I don't want to get into that. But yeah they're there simultaneous - they are simultaneous events. But but you don't why this is important to answer - now you stop and ask this question What is it that makes an event the event it is. What is it that makes a specific event the event that it is.

Speaker 6:
Change?

No it's the substance it happens to, the property that's involved, and the time. Now listen I'll give you your second question but this is very important. Suppose suppose that we had two events E1 and E2 and we wanted to know if these events were the same event or if they were different events that seemed like a reasonable question to you? How would we go about solving that question. Well we'd break this event down into the substance that it involved the property it
involved and the time that it involved and we'd break this event down into the substance it
involved the property it involved and the time it involved.

Now let's play with this a minute to make sure that this is clear. Let's let's come up with a
situation where S1 is the substance is the same but the properties in the times are different or that
the substance is the same and the times the same but the properties are different. OK. So if we
got S1 and S2 and they're the same substance how many substances are we talking about one or
two. Just one. Let's let it be a leaf or let's let it be an apple. OK.

The time is the same. OK. Now the properties are different. OK hold just there simultaneous it
would be when an apple simultaneously became sour and yellow those would be two events in
the same substance that happened at the same time. If at the same time it both turned yellow and
became sour. You understand that? They would be simultaneous they would happen in the same
substance. Now does that make them the same event? No! Why? They involve different
properties. Let's let's play with this a little bit more.

Let's let's have the same substance and the same property in different times. This would be
where an apple let's say one day turned yellow and overnight it became green again and the next
day a turn yellow again. Now there you've got the very same substance - the Apple - turning
yellow on. But it would not be the same event because it happened on two simultaneous to two
different days. There would. Now why are those different events. Is it because they involve
different properties or different substances? no - different times. Now let's take an example of
where the properties in the times are the same but the substances are different.

Here's where you'd have two apples turning yellow. At the same time there you've got two
different substances. They both come to involve the same property and they're at the same time
but they're not the same event. Does that make sense to you? Now you're in. If you followed this
you're in a position now to do more than most of your friends and answering the question is a
thinking a brain event. And if if an event of thinking is an event in my brain that means that the
substance that has the thinking has got to be my brain the property that's going on had darn well
better be a physical property in my brain and the time is not particularly relevant at noon. And
what we're going to what I'm going to show you is that when you have a thinking neither the
property nor the substance that has that property is physical. That's what I'll try to show you later
now break up into groups again. Don't be mad at me for doing this. Please just talk about this
again. As the church ladies had said on Saturday Night Live, "Talk amongst yourselves!"
[laughter and chatter]

Now. I'ma let you go to break in ten minutes. In ten to 20 minutes. But I've got to do one other
thing now and then I'm we're gonna play with this a bit and then we'll take a break. But if we can
get this this other concept down we are going to be in big time position to do some serious
thinking about these questions and what I'm going to have to do now is introduce you to to an it
to a concept that is so obvious that you will be terribly confused when I mention it because it's too obvious and this is something called the nature of identity so if you want to make this point three: the nature [writing pause]...

Here is the law of identity. This is called the law of identity. It's actually called Leibniz's law of the indiscernibility of identicals. But that doesn't matter. This we'll just call it "the law of identity" and it says if A is identical to B, then whatever is true of A is true of B and vice versa. One thing is true, and not true of B or vice versa, that is if one thing is true of B not true of A, then A is not identical to B.

Let me read it again. If A is identical to B then whatever is true of A is true of B and vice versa whatever is true of B is true of A. If there is one thing true of A that's not true of B or vice versa, A is not identical to B.

Now identity means "is the same as" - is the same as. OK? Everything is identical to itself and different from everything else. Now that's why this is so silly. It's almost too too obvious to mention: Everything; every substance every property and every event is identical to itself. For you people intoxicated with science out there let me tell you that every scientific object like chemical elements - this is just, I'll throw this out. You can throw it out. - It stands in the identity relationship to itself and the identity relation is not a physical relation. And what that means is
that there is nothing that is strictly speaking a physical object. There are no physical objects that are completely physical because at least one thing that's true of every material object is that it's identical to itself. That's a fact about material objects and it's not a physical fact about them. It is a metaphysical fact about them.

So the scientists can't even tell us everything about garden variety physical objects. Bless their hearts. Now let's let's take a substance and let's suppose you know sometimes we want to know if one substance is the same as another substance or not. Let's take Jim McCann and let's take the first president of the International School of Theology and suppose that A is Jim McCann. He's a substance remember he's an individual thing that has properties OK, and the first president of the school of theology is a substance, He's an individual object that has properties. Now if Jim McCann is identical to this should have been the letter B. I'm just testing you out there. Sorry. If Jim McCann is identical to the first president of the school of theology. How many substances are we talking about: one or two? Only one.

Only one. Jim McCann who is the first presidential. So whatever is true of Jim McCann he's 5 10 he weighs 155lbs. He has slightly balding brown hair. Those properties had better be true of the first president of the International School of Theology and whatever is true of the first president National School theology - makes $65000 a year - had better be true of Jim McCann, if Jim McCann is a substance that's identical to the first president in your actual school theology.
It makes sense to you? [silent pause] - favorite favorite color.

Now those are properties you see that we want to know if A the color of the sky is identical to aunt Betsy's favorite color if A is the color of the sky is identical to aunt Betsy's favorite color then whatever is true of one - it's lighter than purple but let's say darker than yellow - had better be true of at Betsy's favorite color and vice versa. If there's one thing true of the color of the sky that's not true of the other; Suppose one is lighter than purple but the other is darker than purple. Then what do we know? They're different properties.

OK let's take events. What about the event. What about the event of something being cooked in the kitchen. That's an event. Something's cooking in the kitchen. Right. And let's talk about the event of preparing Uncle Harry's birthday cake. If those are the same events then whatever is true of one it's happening in the kitchen at noon on Friday. It involves a certain substance - a cake - and it involves certain properties being heated and swelling and size and that sort of thing. That had better be whatever is happening in that kitchen it better be true of what's happening to the baking of Uncle Harry's birthday cake. If there's one thing happening to one of those that is involved in one of those events that's not involved in the other at different times or involve different properties or different substances. What do we know? They're not the same event. Are they. You understand that?
Now you understand that identity - the relationship of identity - which just means everything's identical to itself every substance or property or event is the same as itself. Right identity is not I could get down there [writing on chalkboard] But identity is not the relation of cause and effect or functional dependence. Identity is not the relationship of cause and effect or functional dependence. There are different relationships. Now let's talk about this. Again, this is common sense. You understand that A can cause B. B is an effect of A right.

Smoke is a cause. Uh, No. Fire is a cause. Smoke is the effect. Smoke and fire stand in a cause effect relationship. One causes the other. That makes sense? Do you recognize that if A causes B that doesn't prove that a is identical to B because fire causes smoke that doesn't prove fire is the same thing as smoke is fire the same thing is smoke? Why not? [audience mumbling] Yeah you can find something true of one that's not true of the other. So if I were to prove to you listen I can cause smoke by creating a fire and so smoke is nothing but fire. Would you think I would be giving you a really strong argument?

What about this one - I can cause people to experience memories and to feel pains and have certain thoughts by poking electrodes in their brains at certain moments. Therefore memories and thoughts and feelings and sense experiences are nothing but parts of the brain. Is that a good argument? See all of a sudden it's a great argument because it guys were in a white lab coat when
he makes it. That doesn't make it a good argument. It's a lousy argument it's a matter of fact and it's it's strictly speaking obviously false.

So the point I'm making is that if people are going to claim that your brain thinks and that thinking takes place - is a piece of your brain or or something in your brain that moves your behavior whatever - they're going to have to do a lot more than prove a causal connection between my mind and brain. They're going to have to do a lot more than show that certain things that I caused can cause certain mental events and those mental events therefore have gotta be just physical things in your brain. They're gonna have to prove identity.

They're gonna have to show that whatever is true of my thought life is true of my brain and vice versa. Or they have not made their case. What about functional dependence? After this we'll take a break. Well functional dependence is when A depends on B in order for A to function. A depends on B. In order for A to function. You follow me on this? So we might say for example that the Pistons in a car depend upon the spark plugs before they can function and move. You understand that? Would you agree then that if something goes wrong with those spark plugs the Pistons won't function any longer - Is that clear to you? Does that prove that the spark plugs are identical to the Pistons? Because someone has Alzheimer's disease and can no longer have certain memories or thoughts. Does that prove that memories and thoughts are parts of the brain? It does not. It only shows that there is a functional dependence between brain and mind. If they're going to prove that memories are located in the brain and parts of the brain they're gonna have to
demonstrate that everything we know about a memory is nothing but physical information and that's all

And that is very difficult. In fact it's so I'll show you. It is impossible to prove and will forever be impossible. OK let let's just make sure that we're sort of on board here. You know if I'm in a car. Here's my view of the soul. This isn't quite accurate but this'll do. I am to my body like a driver is to a car. If I'm trapped inside the car would you agree that I'm not going to be able to get around town. If my car breaks down right? If I can't get out of the car and if my car breaks down I'm stuck and I can't move. That doesn't prove I'm my car. Now what happens if I can get out of the car? I might be able to move around again.

My view is that while the soul is in the body its ability to function depends upon a functioning brain and nervous system and body and might I say vice versa. A good body depends on a functioning and happy and cheerful and spiritually well-adjusted mind. Because if you have a person whose mind is filled with worry it can literally change the shape of the brain. A mental event of thinking can change your brain shape. There is a real - that doesn't prove that they're the same. One comment and then we'll take a little break. Two comments then we'll take a break. Yes sir. [inaudible question]
If A is identical to B, whatever is true of A is true of B and whatever is true of B is true of A. This is not a controversial definition. It simply follows from what identity means. Identity means something is the same as itself. If I'm the same as myself I'm as tall as myself. I'm as heavy as myself. The right. Yes ma'am. Yes ma'am.

Speaker 7:
In the example of Alzheimer's, is it, is it conceivable that this person's mind might still be thinking -

Moreland:
Right. Possible. It's like that's possible. And see right. And see, here's the here's what I think might have been the truth and what our brother was saying a while ago about thoughts can be observed indirectly. I think I would rather say they can't be observed indirectly but we can know what they are indirectly in the sense that I can make known to you my thoughts by body movements. I can create sounds I can say the cat is on the mat. And you know that I'm thinking about that. You will never be able to know for sure however that I'm doing that because you'll never be able to get inside and observe my thoughts. I could be lying to you. I could be using the sound the cat is on the mouth set the mat to say "Get me some cheese and crackers" and if I were going to if I were attempting to delude you you'd never know.

I did this with my fifth grade daughter - I said You know honey what would happen? I said you know. I can't see God if I could see God I'd be able to pray to him and I said you can't see your
mother remember that and I said you can't see your thoughts and sensations. And I said you know for all you know when mom looks at this blue object it appears blue to you but it may appear red to her but she uses the word blue to refer to it. Now I said I don't think that's true. And the reason I don't is because our faculties are a lot like one another and because there's a close analogy between us there's a pretty good chance that we all see the same color when we look at the same object but but we can but it is not inconceivable that when I am appeared to bluely she's appeared to redly and she uses the same word everybody else but has an inverted one inverted color spectrum.

Now what I tell you you don't what's important about that fact this is not just a puzzle, a kind of funny puzzle. What's important about that is this is enough to prove that you're not your brain. You know how? Because no amount of inspection of my wife's brain ten thousand years from now if we have more sophisticated electron microscopes and we can look at every single atom and every single wave and every single magnetic event and electrical I've been going on in my wife's brain - We will never ever no matter how much we learn about her brain ever be able to tell whether she's experiencing red or yellow when she looks at a red book. Never! We'll never be able to tell. Now you want to think about that. [inaudible comment]

Say it again. Oh yeah. Yes. [inaudible comment continues]
If not no. And here's why. He said well what if the mind shapes the brain right. Well first of all you'd have to know what the mind was before you can make a statement like that. And then you'd already know that the mind is different. But secondly here's the other important point. The same effect can often be produced by different causes and so causes - I don't mean to get technical with you but causes are always always on effects always underdetermine their causes. You can never guarantee a cause by an effect.

Let's take a 10 minute break. This has been pretty heavy. Let's take a 10 minute break and come back.